

Remarks

The claims have been amended without prejudice.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph based on an allegation that the FPGA does not include memory containing a schedule of rules and location constraints.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's attention is directed to the following places in the specification where FPGA and memory is described:

page 6, lines 6-10,

page 9, lines 9-22,

page 10, lines 5-8.

In addition, the memory being programmed for a schedule of rules and location restraints is set forth in U.S. Patent 5,731,757 which is incorporated by reference. See page 7, lines 10-14. In light of these disclosures it is believed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 has been obviated. Withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman et al. in view of Krasner. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First Hoffman et al. relates to a personal tracking system and is not designed for use on the limb of an offender which needs to continuously send signals to a central database system, but be small enough to conserve energy powering the system.

Secondly, the Examiner admits that Hoffman et al. does not disclose a matched filtering GPS receiver with an RF front end connected to the GPS receiver. See applicant's page 11, lines 13-19. In addition, the Hoffman et al. device has no means to acquire updates to a GPS

LARSON & LARSON,
ATTORNEYS
AT
LAW

11199-69th STREET N.
LARGO, FL 33773-5504
PH. 727-546-0660
FAX 727-545-1595

almanac as described in applicant's specification, page 6, lines 2-4; page 10, last two lines; and page 11, lines 1-12. The Examiner attempts to cure the Hoffman et al. lack of disclosure with the Krasner reference. The Examiner suggests that one having ordinary skill in the art would substitute the GPS receiver of Krasner for the GPS receiver of Hoffman et al. This pre-supposes that Krasner or Hoffman et al. suggests such a substitution. Nothing is further from the truth. Krasner merely describes GPS receivers and a method for processing GPS signals. There is no suggestion in Krasner that it can be used in an offender body worn device for directly communicating special coordinates to multiple remote sites. In particular, applicant's device requires having a means to acquire updates to the GPS almanac. No such means is found in either Hoffman et al. or Krasner. All of claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-18 require the means to acquire updates to a GPS almanac in the GPS receiver and the GPS receiver is connected to a matched filtering GPS receiver. Such a combination is not shown in Hoffman et al. and Krasner taken together. These references do not make applicant's claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-18 obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition to the above, it is noted that claim 13 requires the central station computer to contain an algorithm for comparing the current location of the body worn device and comparing the location to a schedule of rules and location restraints. No such comparison is noted in Hoffman et al. together with Krasner. Since Hoffman et al. is a personal security monitoring system there is no central processing station comparing rules or location constraints as in applicant's claim 13. For this additional reason, the rejection of claim 13 should be withdrawn.

LARSON & LARSON,
ATTORNEYS
AT
LAW

11199-69th STREET N.
LARGO, FL 33773-5504
PH. 727-546-0660
FAX 727-545-1595

The Examiner further rejected claims 6 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman et al. and Krasner and further in view of Revell et al. Claim 6 is dependent on claim 1 and claim 15 is dependent on claim 12. For the same reasons stated above they are not obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Revell et al. taken in combination with Hoffman et al. and Krasner merely teaches a polling type alarm system having a personal alarm signal. There is no suggestion for using a low profile vibrator in the system such as claimed by applicant in claims 6 and 15. Hoffman et al., Krasner and Revell et al. fail to make applicant's claims 6 and 15 obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.


The prior art of record and not relied upon; namely, Krasner 5,884,214 and 5,831,574 and Kawasaki do not teach a passive system attached to a limb of an offender having a GPS receiver with a means to acquire updates to a GPS almanac and a matched filtering GPS receiver.

In view of all the above, it is believed that claims 1-18 as amended, are now in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

LARSON & LARSON,
ATTORNEYS
AT
LAW

11199-69th STREET N.
LARGO, FL 33773-5504
PH. 727-546-0660
FAX 727-545-1595

Respectfully submitted,



Herbert W. Larson
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 21008